

### **REMARKS**

This is in response to the Office Action that was mailed on March 14, 2006. Claim 38 is cancelled, without prejudice. Claim 1 is amended, based upon the corrected translation of the underlying PCT application filed concurrently herewith. Attention is drawn to such disclosure therein as “the imide compound is crystallized with a solvent selected from a hydrocarbon, a chain ether and water from a reaction mixture” in lines 9-11 on page 48 and “These solvents can be used singly or in combination” in line 17 on page 49. No new matter is introduced by this Amendment. Entry of this Amendment – in order to place the application into condition for allowance or into better condition for appeal – is respectfully solicited. With this Amendment, claims 1-3 and 18 remain pending in the application.

On page 5 of the Office Action, objection was raised to the specification as containing new matter. The version of the specification in question is now being replaced by a corrected version (corrected translation of the underlying PCT application), thereby obviating the stated objection.

Claims 1-3 and 18 were rejected under the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. § 112 as failing to comply with the written description requirement. Office Action, pages 6-7. The rejection is respectfully traversed.

The essence of the rationale for the rejection is embodied in the Examiner’s contention that “there is not mention anywhere in applicants’ specification of only using the hydrocarbon or the chain ether as the solvent for the crystallization of the imide compound from a reaction mixture obtained by an oxidation reaction of only a monocyclic C<sub>4</sub>-C<sub>16</sub>cycloalkane substrate”. Applicants maintain that the disclosure in the paragraph bridging pages 48-49 of the (new) specification – “When the reaction product is low or weak polar compound (an oxidation reaction product from a monocyclic C<sub>4-16</sub>cycloalkane), it is preferred that a hydrocarbon or chain ether is employed as the solvent for crystallization” – constitutes adequate basis for reciting a

hydrocarbon or chain ether as a solvent with an oxidation reaction product of a monocyclic C<sub>4</sub>-<sub>16</sub>cycloalkane in the claims.

Withdrawal of the rejection of record, and passage of this application to Issue, is respectfully solicited.


Claim 38 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by US 5,030,739 (Foricher). Inasmuch as claim 38 has been cancelled, this ground of rejection is moot.

The Examiner is invited to contact Richard Gallagher (Reg. No. 28,781) at (703) 205-8008 with any questions.

If necessary, the Commissioner is hereby authorized in this, concurrent, and future replies, to charge payment or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 02-2448 for any additional fee required under 37 CFR 1.16 or 1.17; particularly, extension of time fees.

Dated: August 10, 2006

Respectfully submitted,

By  #28,781  
Raymond C. Stewart  
Registration No.: 21,066  
BIRCH, STEWART, KOLASCH & BIRCH, LLP  
8110 Gatehouse Road  
Suite 100 East  
P.O. Box 747  
Falls Church, Virginia 22040-0747  
(703) 205-8000  
Attorney for Applicant